I?m against the acquisition by AT&T. T-Mobile has a great reputation as a value leader and having the best customer service. To prove my point, J.D. Power has rated TMobile #1 for many years. T-Mobile also has a more reliable network. So TMobile customers would see a service degradation from the acquisition. While they don?t have the 3G footprint of AT&T, they are expanding aggressively and have a powerful 4G network already, and they were late to mobile broadband.

Regarding spectrum, I know that AT&T possesses quite a bit of spectrum on their own, much more than T-Mobile. They even own enough spectrum (somewhere close to 100 MHz) to build all over the nation. But, the problem is that their spectrum isn?t harmonized (meaning that they don?t have a single frequency band that is used all over their network). T-Mobile is fortunate enough to have at least 20-30 MHz of spectrum in every market in the AWS-1 (1700 MHz UL/2100 MHz DL) band range, with an additional 10-20 MHz in the PCS (1900 MHz) band range. AT&T?s spectrum is all over the place, some 10-20 MHz here and there in Cellular (850 MHz), some 15-20 MHz here and there in PCS, about 10 MHz in most areas in US Dig Div (U.S. Digital Dividend ? 700 MHz), and about 10MHz in the western half of the country on AWS-1. This situation can be solved by using currently available technologies to combine these frequencies as if it was in one large block of spectrum, with minimal performance and cost differences. Without T-Mobile, they would prefer to have tri-band LTE devices right out of the gate to utilize the frequencies they have, considering we have millions of 5-band devices in use, this shouldn't be a problem. However, AT&T?s overall spectrum concentration in every single market that they both participate in (and several markets that T-Mobile doesn?t yet participate in), is much higher than T-Mobile?s.

Obviously, AT&T?s spectrum on PCS and Cellular is wide enough that they can run both 2G and 3G services on the same spectrum band. That demonstrates that they have a plethora of spectrum to initially build out LTE on their current spectrum holdings. Provided, of course, that AT&T is willing to decommission their older 2G networks in order to free up spectrum. NTT DoCoMo has committed to this in Japan, demonstrating that decommissioning older networks is not only feasible, but improves spectral efficiency (moving from EDGE to LTE) and makes network operations more budget friendly.

The spectrum crunch that AT&T harps on is not accurate. For years, AT&T held AWS-1 spectrum with no network using it. Why? Because they didn?t want to offer devices that would be compatible on their only GSM competitor?s network (T-Mobile). An attempt to control the flow of high-end, and innovative devices.

As far as band frequency support for LTE, I know for a fact that Ericsson has several multi-band LTE chips that support the frequency bands used in the United States for 3G. Qualcomm?s Gobi chips that have LTE support also do support the frequency bands for LTE. Multi-band chips are not an issue, since the manufacturers were prepared this time. Nokia-Siemens Networks, Ericsson, Motorola Network Solutions, Alcatel-Lucent, and Huawei are also all ready for building out towers that

broadcast LTE on any of the currently used frequency bands for 3G, and of course, they support US Dig Div spectrum. Enabling them to utilize all their spectrum holdings, which they don't today (then complain that there isn't enough spectrum for them not to use). So AT&T will not have a problem getting multi-band LTE chips for cheap, because they are massive enough that the economies of scale will kick in very quickly. They don?t need T-Mobile for any sort of spectrum crunch alleviation.

While AT&T claims TMobile has no plans for LTE, this isn't true. TMobile doesn't have definitive plans, but they have several plans described for deploying 4G LTE. One plan was that they would reuse PCS (1900MHz) spectrum to use with LTE after they?ve built out their HSPA+ network sufficiently enough that they can begin to decommission their 2G GSM network. That plan was going to initiate in 2012, in areas that have HSPA+ built out completely. Gradually, they would have replaced 2G with LTE. Since their 2G spectrum is pretty substantial in most areas, the 4G speeds will be substantial. The expenses would have been the biggest issue, since it would have required several billion dollars. This plan was detailed during the January investors? conference that T-Mobile USA and its parent, Deutsche Telekom, held.

There was also another option that was seriously discussed by T-Mobile USA executives for launching LTE. That was doing another network-sharing agreement, similar to the one T-Mobile USA had with Cingular for their GSM network before Cingular became part of Bell South (now AT&T). T-Mobile could partner with the many rural and regional carriers across the nation to combine their PCS spectrum and build out a nationwide LTE network that would have a larger footprint than any other carrier in the country. Much like the way Verizon will be doing it. They could also partner with Sprint/Clear and work together on building out a LTE network on the PCS band. Considering the culture similarity between T-Mobile USA and Sprint, it could work out well for both of the companies. T-Mobile could have partnered with AT&T, given the compatible technologies and complementary spectrum. Unfortunately, such a partnership probably wouldn?t work well because they have very different corporate cultures and values. It would just fall through.

AT&T?s acquisition of T-Mobile USA would create a GSM monopoly. The two competing GSM networks have allowed for a wide variety of devices to come into the American market, as GSM is the world standard, device makers tend to use GSM. This would make world travelers only viable option AT&T so we could expect that AT&T's international roaming prices to spike as T-Mobile would no longer be able to force down the prices of international roaming.

AT&T will crush T-Mobile?s open culture after the acquisition is complete, in it's place, AT&T's monopolistic conservative culture. AT&T doesn?t really get open networks and open solutions. Their Android devices are locked down by blocking the sideloading of apps. They are the only carrier in the world that does that, by the way. AT&T prefers nickel-and-diming customers instead of making them happy enough to continue staying with AT&T, which is why they chose femtocells instead of UMA.

UMA did exist before femtocells. UMA was built into the GSM standard with the EDGE and UMTS standards. In fact, femtocells rely on a variant of UMA technology to work. If AT&T acquires T-Mobile, they?ll probably kill off the G-series of Android devices, which are one of the only that are pure Google Experience devices. UMA will probably disappear as well. And of course, no more Even More Plus plans (which discount monthly rates if you pay for the device upfront and has no contract, where as if AT&T let's you buy a device upfront, they charge the same per month and just let's you off contract free) and unlimited data plans.

Another point is that AT&T is saying that it will take at least 3 years to integrate the networks. Not exactly instantaneous as they have been saying. Also, by that time, if they really do need more spectrum after having time to make the spectrum they have more efficient, and actually use why they have, there will be more spectrum actions and more spectrum efficient technologies available, alleviating some of their concerns if they actually use these newer technologies.

Now, the effect on jobs. AT&T has said that they would be shutting the doors at T-Mobile stores that are no longer necessary since they are close enough to current AT&T stores. Also, the AT&T stores would likely not need more employment, meaning that the current T-Mobile sales team would likely be fired in near entirety since AT&T has more than 2,200 stores that needed to compete with T-Mobile, that's how they were set up. Looking down the line, T-Mobile's suppliers. Ericsson, Alcatel-Lucent, Hawai, Nokia Siemens Systems, and Cisco along with others would be supplying one less provider. This could be catastrophic since many of these companies are already struggling to turn a profit. That would mean these companies would have to layoff many employees, cancel their orders and reduce pay of their smaller workforce, in attempt to conserve cash. This means a tighter supply chain, which has already had problems keeping up with the demand for components and systems to upgrade our networks. The decreased order would mean a loss of revenue in factories worldwide, a lower volume, so a smaller workforce, which means that more people would be let go from their job. The towns, regions and countries that used to employ these people would have their economy put into peril, including our own. Increasing the poverty rate, dropping the number of high school dropouts and the number of college degrees would decrease dramatically. Peoples spending on goods and services would decrease, stunting economic progress and possibly returning the economy to what is was a few years ago.

In conclusion, AT&T's argument that this would help their spectrum position doesn't hold, since A) they aren't using spectrally efficient technologies, nor B) are the using the spectrum they have. The argument that this would alleviate their network problems faster than building out their network themselves is overstated. As they said, it will take 3 years to integrate the network, of which some assets will be divested anyway, while AT&T has said it would take 5 years to build it themselves. Two extra years to fix a network that as of right now, isn't bad. It was, but they have already fixed most issues. Also, the loss of jobs in TMobile retail, marketing, suppliers like Alcatel Lucent, Ericsson,

Haiwai and others, including many more American companies are numerous at a time that we need to make many new jobs. So, with these reasons, I think that AT&T should not be allowed to acquire T-Mobile USA.